Message

From: Whitcomb, Jill [jiwhitcomb@pa.gov]

Sent: 6/27/2019 12:40:50 PM

To: Chris Sigmund [ChrisS@teamaginc.com]; John J. Bell [jjbell@pfb.com]

jdrafarm@frontier.com; Brown, Karl [kbrown@pa.gov]; Jennifer Reed-Harry [jrharry@pennag.com];

bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; Baker, Jordan [c-jorbaker@pa.gov];

Trentacoste, Emily [trentacoste.emily@epa.gov]; Kristen Wolf [kwolf@pa.gov]

Subject: RE: [External] Re: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL

REPORT

Thanks, Chris. I appreciate your time and thoughts to get at the whole picture.

The \$354 million is based on CAST, which I do not believe includes grant administration/management and E&O that is need to get BMPs implemented.

The workload analysis performed for meeting the ag goals includes Inspections (site visits) and Technical assistance needed to get BMPs on the ground; I also included additional time spent providing education and outreach built into the TA hours (time spent designing a BMP and time spent meeting with/discussing/decision-making) since I see E&O as a piece of technical assistance, but not as a stand-alone. I didn't quantify grant administration and management – 5-10% is about right to manage/administer grants, but I need to check with the Funding workgroup because I thought that they may have figured that into their numbers and didn't want to provide duplicate figures.

Jill Whitcomb | Chief, Non-Point Source Compliance Section Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Clean Water Rachel Carson State Office Building 400 Market Street | Harrisburg, PA 17105-8774 Phone: (717) 783-5205 | Fax: (717) 772-4474

<u>www.dep.pa.gov</u>

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any use of this information other than by the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this message in error, please send a reply e-mail to the sender and delete the material from any and all computers. Unintended transmissions shall not constitute waiver of the attorney-client or any other privilege.

From: Chris Sigmund < Chris S@teamaginc.com> Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 4:59 PM

To: John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>

Cc: Goodlander, Douglas <dgoodlande@pa.gov>; Hostetter, Gregory <grhostette@pa.gov>; mzr154@psu.edu;

@hotmail.com; dgmkhc@centurylink.net; jamesharbach@hotmail.com; embarqmail.com;
jdrafarm@frontier.com; Brown, Karl <kbrown@pa.gov>; Jennifer Reed-Harry <jrharry@pennag.com>; bchain@cbf.org;
jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>; Baker, Jordan <cjorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>

Subject: [External] Re: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA SPAM@pa.gov.

John,

I have completed my review of the report.

My only comment pertains to number 11.a. (block grants).

I made a number of comments at the last meeting relating to this topic. My comments were not included in the report so I'll mention them again. In general, I'm hoping block grants can achieve the outcomes outlined in this section. I hope the money can be used efficiently to improve farm profitability and water quality by reducing nutrient and sediment lose from farms. I hope a significant number of farms can be helped and significant improvements in water quality are realized.

At our meeting it was explained that up to 28 percent of the block grants can go towards grant administration (3 percent), grant management (10 percent), and outreach and education (15 percent). Does the annual cost estimate of \$354 million include in our report also include the above costs/cost categories or should this number be increased by 28 percent? I have no way of knowing if 28 percent is a high or low but I assume someone has or will work to confirm the accuracy of these projected expenses to ensure PA gets maximum value from these expenditures. I think PennVest allows a project administration/management fee that is equal to 4 percent of the cost of a project.

The report should encourage county conservation districts to actively pursue public private partnerships as part of their efforts to deliver conservation to the farm level through these black grants. These partnerships can be established by requesting qualifications and proposals from interested parties. Key performance metrics (KPMs) should be connected to the block grants so performance can be measured.

Thank you and the rest of the team for all of your work on this report.

Best regards,

Chris

On Jun 25, 2019, at 3:18 PM, John J. Bell jibell@pfb.com> wrote:

Good afternoon, everyone,

This is a friendly reminder that any concerns with or suggested changes to the draft version of the Workgroup's final report should be provided to me by **no later than close of business day tomorrow**.

So far, I've only received suggested changes from Doug Goodlander, which you all should have received. By the process we have been employing in the effort to produce a final version of our Workgroup report, all portions of the draft in which no concern or suggestion is offered is presumed to be approved without change by the Workgroup.

Although I would welcome any specific language changes you want to offer, I'm not necessarily asking any of you who believes changes or additions should be made to draft it. If you want something changed but don't have specific language to offer, I will

try to work with you in drafting language consistent with your wishes (within reason, of course).

I would also like to alert you to a development that occurred at the recent meeting of the Workgroup Co-Chairs. Our revised draft report (page 19 of Version 3) includes a recommendation for development of a Center for Agriculture Environmental Excellence to provide guidance and help coordinate local and regional actions and management of resources in implementing the agricultural conservation measures recommended in the Phase 3 WIP. Other Workgroups have made similar recommendations for a local or regional coordinator of effort and resource management, relative to conservation measures those Workgroups are recommending. Our Co-Chairs will be meeting with other Workgroup Co-Chairs on July 9 to discuss the possibility of having one entity, rather than multiple entities, carry out the responsibility of regional and local coordination and resource management, and perform its responsibility over a broader spectrum of conservation measures than any one sector. We may need to consider and offer comment on what emerges conceptually from that meeting

Again, if you have any questions, concerns or suggestions on the version 3 of the draft, please don't hesitate to call me (717-731-3547) or email me (jibell@pfbl.com).

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell

Senior, Government Affairs Counsel Government Affairs and Communications Division 717.731.3547

<image001.png>

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.

From: John J. Bell

Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 6:37 PM

To: John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>; dgoodlande@pa.gov; grhostette@pa.gov; mzr154@psu.edu; @hotmail.com; dgmkhc@centurylink.net; jamesharbach@hotmail.com jdrafarm@frontier.com; kbrown@pa.gov; jrharry@pennag.com; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; chriss@teamaginc.com

Cc: Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>

Subject: Version 3 of Ag Workgroup Final Report Per Consideration at June 10 Workgroup meeting

Importance: High

Hi, Folks,

Attached is the third version of the Workgroup's draft final report for your review and consideration. This version attempts capture discussion and resolution of matters considered at the June 10 meeting, relative to the text highlighted in the 2nd Version (circulated to Workgroup members in my email of June 7).

The first attachment contains the draft text for the 3rd version of the report. The areas shaded in blue identify the areas that were considered for change and the draft changes that are being offered in response to the discussion and resolution of matters considered at the June 10 meeting.

For some areas, the draft change reflects the language changes crafted at the meeting. For others, the change reflects my attempt to capture what was agreed or consented to in concept at the meeting.

The second attachment contains explanatory notes for numerous passages of revised text shaded in blue. Each of the explanatory notes have a number that corresponds with the number appearing in alongside the text revision in the draft document. This is to help you identify and match up text and explanatory note. For example, the explanatory note for text revision identified by the number in the draft report will be note 4 in the notes document.

There are still a few changes in text language or table figures that will need to be performed by our technical support staff (Jill, Jordan and Emily). These are specifically noted in the body of the draft, and are identified in those areas to which they apply.

Those portions of text that do not appear in blue shading were included in prior draft versions and received no negative comment or expression of concern from Workgroup members. I will note again that portions without shading are presumed to be acceptable to Workgroup members, and will be part of the final version of our report, unless a question or concern is raised. So if you do have a problem with any of those areas, speak now, or forever hold your peace.

For the good of the order (and my mental well-being), I am requesting any questions, objections or suggested changes to the 3rd Version be provided to me by close of business next Wednesday, June 26.

Please don't hesitate to contact me by email or phone (direct office line: 717-731-3547) if you have any questions on regarding the contents of either of these attached documents.

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell

Senior, Government Affairs Counsel Government Affairs and Communications Division

717.731.3547

<image001.png>

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.